

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_100658
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOTCHEMICAL COMPOSITION AND ANTI-MOTILITY EFFECTS OF NAPOLEONAE IMPERIALIS METHANOL CRUDE LEAF EXTRACT AND FRACTIONS IN RATS
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Assuming that most lines of research are interesting, this work contributes to local science. It presents a complete, objective, integrative and relevant study for the local population.</p> <p>The title is appropriate. Objective and with efficient descriptors.</p> <p>The summary is correct. Describe in a simple way all the intention and expression of the research.</p> <p>The work is intentionally distributed, to facilitate the interpretation and the search for the results are in evidence.</p> <p>By presenting a research with scientific data in base, a little old, the work is correct.</p> <p>The work is in accordance with the chosen purpose, fulfilling its social and scientific function.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It's suitable.</p> <p>Objective and without interference.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pedro Henrique Silva de Rossi
Department, University & Country	Brazil